



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

76

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/014,718 | 11/07/2001 | Matt Taylor | | 4136 |
| 7590 | 06/19/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| Matt Taylor c/o R.K. Bruce Jr., CPA Suite 200 640 S. Fourth St. Louisville, KY 40202 | | | NGUYEN, TAN D | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3629 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/014,718 | TAYLOR ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Tan Dean D. Nguyen | Art Unit 3629 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. **Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

In order for the claimed invention to be statutory subject matter, the claimed invention must fall within one of the four statutory classes of invention as set forth in § 101 (i.e. (1) a process, (2) machine (apparatus), (3) manufacture (article of manufacture), or (4) composition of matter).

In the present case, claims 1-7, 8-14, 15-21, 22-28 are directed to “An iterative, feedback driven method for building and sustaining ValueWebs”, which is not within one of the classes of invention set forth in § 101.

The “method for an iterative, feedback driven method for building and sustaining ValueWebs” comprising the steps of:

- (a) means for imbedding mind like characteristics and behavior in agents
- (b) means for facilitating emergence in agents.

are merely a disembodied abstract idea and do not produce a (1) useful and (2) tangible, and (3) concrete result. It's not clear what are the results of the invention since step (a) calls for “mind like characteristics and behavior” in agents which is vague since “mind like” is relative term which would not produce concrete results and it's not clear the connection of this step to step (b) and the result of (b). However, § 101, 2nd test

requires that the result be reproducible or repeatable to meet the tangible and concrete requirement. See *In re Swartz*, 232 F.3d 862, 864, 56 USPQ2d 1703, 1704 (Fed. Circuit 2000).

Moreover, there is no physical transformation of anything to another state or thing even though this is dispositive. Therefore, claims 1-28 are thus drawn to the abstract idea of building and sustaining Value Webs, rather than to a practical application of the idea as required by 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It's not clear what the term "Value Webs" means in the claims and in the specification.

4. The term "mind like" in claims 1-28 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "mind like" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

5. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled

in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term “Value Webs” in claims 1-7, 8-14 is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term.

6. Method claims 8-14, 22-28 provides for the use of building and sustaining Value Webs, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 8-14, 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

7. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. On page 200, applicant mentions that the fully integrated environment of the present invention, an example of which is shown in Figure SS2-1B is noted. However, this Figure is not in the specification. Moreover, on the same page 200, there are

discussion of many Figures, SS2-3A-C, Figs. 221 #A and 3B, to further provide understanding to the claimed invention, however, these Figures are missing from the specification.

8. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In these claims, it's not clear what the term "Value Webs" means.

9. Claims 1-7, 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the preamble calls for "an iterative, feedback driven system for building and sustaining Value Webs" but fails to include in the body how the limitation of "iterative", or "feedback", "building the Value Webs", or "sustaining Value Webs" is carried out in the body of the claim. Similarly, there are no discussion of the term "Value Webs" in the body of the claims.

Similarly, claims 8-14 are rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 1 above.

In claim 15, the preamble calls for "an iterative, feedback driven system for building Agents" but fails to include in the body how the limitation of "iterative", or "feedback", "building the Value Webs", or "sustaining Value Webs" is carried out in the body of the claim. Similarly, there are no discussion of the term "Agents" in the body of the claims.

Similarly, claims 22-28 are rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 15 above.

Claim Objections

10. Claims 2-7 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

In dep. claim 2, which calls for "used for facilitating interaction among agents .. compressed time period", it's not clear how this claim further limit independent claim 1 above?

Similarly, dep. claims 3-7 are objected for the same reason set forth in dep. claim 2 above.

Similarly, dep. claims 9, 16, 23 are objected for the same reason set forth in dep. claim 2 above.

Similarly, dep. claims 10-14, 17-21, 23-28 are objected for the same reason set forth in dep. claims 3-7 above.

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 3629

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [http://pair-direct@uspto.gov](mailto:pair-direct@uspto.gov). Should you have any questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

In receiving an Office Action, it becomes apparent that certain documents are missing, e. g. copies of references, Forms PTO 1449, PTO-892, etc., requests for copies should be directed to Tech Center 3600 Customer Service at (571) 272-3600, or e-mail CustomerService3600@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of the examination of the application should be directed to Dean Tan Nguyen at telephone number (571) 272-6806. My work schedule is normally Monday through Friday from 6:30 am - 4:00 pm. I am scheduled to be off every other Friday.

Should I be unavailable during my normal working hours, my supervisor John Weiss can be reached at (571) 272-6812.

The main FAX phone numbers for formal communications concerning this application are (571) 273-8300. My personal Fax is (571) 273-6806. Informal communications may be made, following a telephone call to the examiner, by an informal FAX number to be given.

dtn
June 12, 2006

DEAN T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dean Nguyen".